

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2000-F214-1

Short Proposal Title: Distribution patterns of Hg in tidal WL ecosystems of N. S.F. Bay

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes; the authors assume temporal and spatial patterns of methylmercury production in wetlands and have designed the study to test the hypothesis. Objectives are very clear - to assist CalFed managers and others in choosing wetland restoration sites where Hg contamination is not expected to be a concern.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes; I believe that the authors have shown that the existing literature supports their hypothesis. They will, in essence, be testing what others have done elsewhere in the S.F. Bay area.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Perhaps; three sites may not be adequate. Also, as I understand it, methylation occurs in the upper few cm of the sediment, yet the authors propose only sampling in "deep sediments".

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, as above, information on methylation and demethylation in the SF Bay/Delta is sparse, at best. The results should increase our knowledge of these processes, as well as their impact on the wetland ecosystem.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Hopefully. That is, if the study "disproves" the null hypothesis, the results could help inform decisions regarding prioritizing wetlands for restoration.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, the authors propose to evaluate sedimentation rates, Hg concentrations, and bioaccumulation at the sampling sites.

b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes; it is clear that the authors are experienced and have undertaken other complex scientific studies.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes; no new techniques or equipment are proposed.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Effective, yes; their efficiency I question. The budget seems high for a study that includes only three stations.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

What was the purpose of all the different budgets? There was no explanation and I have never seen a proposal before with more than one.

overall evaluation explanation (I couldn't access that field): Although the proposal has some flaws, this is a study that is long overdue and is key to informed decision-making regarding Calfed wetland restoration projects.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☒ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]
